arXiv:1401.1588v1 [math.AG] 8 Jan 2014

LOG DEL PEZZO SURFACES WITH LARGE VOLUMES

KENTO FUJITA

Abstract. We classify all of the log del Pezzo surfaces S of index a such that the volume $(-K_S^2)$ is larger than or equal to $2a$.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to classify all of the log del Pezzo surfaces of fixed index with large anti-canonical volumes. A normal projective variety S is called a *log Fano variety* if S is log-terminal and the anti-canonical divisor $-K_S$ is ample. We call 2-dimensional log Fano varieties as *log del Pezzo surfaces*. For a log Fano variety S, the *index* of S is defined as the smallest positive integer a such that $-aK_S$ is Cartier. Log del Pezzo surfaces S with fixed index a have been treated by many authors in various viewpoint.

We recall the viewpoint in terms of the classification problem of log del Pezzo surfaces. If $a = 1$ then all such S are classified by several authors, see [Bre80, Dem80, HW81]; if $a = 2$ then all such S are classified in [AN88, AN89, AN06, Nak07]; and if $a = 3$ then all such S are classified in [FY14]. However, it is not realistic to classify *all* of the log del Pezzo surfaces of (fixed) index $a \geq 4$ since even for the case $a = 3$ there are 300 types of such log del Pezzo surfaces (see [FY14]).

On the other hand, the problem of the boundedness for log Fano varieties of fixed index a is also important in the area of minimal model program. The problem is equivalent to bound the anti-canonical volume $(-K_S^n)$ for such S if the characteristic of the base field is zero. Such problem is called the Batyrev conjecture. See [Bor01, HMX12]. We remark that the authors in [HMX12] showed that the Baryrev conjecture is true (in any dimension, if the characteristic of the base field is zero). Nowadays, a generalized version of the Batyrev conjecture, called the BAB conjecture, is considered by many authors, see [BB92, Ale94, AM04, Lai12, Jia13]. The BAB conjecture is true for

Date: January 9, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14J26; Secondary 14E30.

Key words and phrases. del Pezzo surface, rational surface, extremal ray.

log del Pezzo surfaces but is open in higher-dimensional case. Note that, as a corollary of [Jia13], any log del Pezzo surface S of index $a \geq 2$ satisfies that $(-K_S^2) \leq (2a^2+4a+2)/a$ and equality holds if and only if S is isomorphic to the weighted projective plane $\mathbb{P}(1,1,2a)$.

In this paper, we classify the log del Pezzo surfaces S of index $a \geq 4$ such that $(-K_S^2) \geq 2a$. The motivation is related to both the classification problem and the boundedness problem. We note that log del Pezzo surfaces S of index $a \leq 3$ are completely classified.

Theorem 1.1. *Let S be a log del Pezzo surface of index $a \geq 4$. Then $(-K_S^2) \geq 2a$ holds if and only if S is isomorphic to the log del Pezzo surface associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of length b with $b = \lfloor (a+1)/2 \rfloor$ whose type is one of the following:*

(1) $\langle \mathrm{O} \rangle_a \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+4a+2)/a)$,
(2) $\langle \mathrm{I} \rangle_a \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+3a+2)/a)$,
(3) $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+2a+2)/a)$,
(4) $\langle \mathrm{III} \rangle_a \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+a+2)/a)$,
(5) $\langle \mathrm{A} \rangle_5 \quad (\textit{if } a=5) \quad ((-K_S^2) = 54/5)$,
(6) $\langle \mathrm{IV} \rangle_a \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+2)/a)$,
(7) $\langle \mathrm{B} \rangle_4 \quad (\textit{if } a=4) \quad ((-K_S^2) = 8)$,
(8) $\langle \mathrm{C} \rangle_4 \quad (\textit{if } a=4) \quad ((-K_S^2) = 8)$.

We describe the above types in Section 4.1.

By Theorem 1.1 and the arguments in Section 4, we have the following result. We note that we do not use the results in [Jia13] in order to prove Corollary 1.2.

Corollary 1.2. *Let S be a log del Pezzo surface of index $a \geq 2$. Then $(-K_S^2) > 2(a+1)$ holds if and only if S is isomorphic to one of the following (We describe the following varieties in Section 4.2.) :*

(1) $\mathbb{P}(1,1,2a) \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+4a+2)/a)$,
(2) $S_{\mathrm{I},a} \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+3a+2)/a)$,
(3) $S_{\mathrm{II}_1,a} \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+2a+2)/a)$,
(4) $S_{\mathrm{II}_2,a} \quad ((-K_S^2) = (2a^2+2a+2)/a)$,
(5) $\mathbb{P}(1,1,3) \quad (\textit{if } a=3) \quad ((-K_S^2) = 25/3)$.

We remark that all of them are toric varieties.

The strategy for the classification is essentially same as the strategy in [FY14] based on the earlier work in [Nak07]. First, we reduce the classification problem of log del Pezzo surfaces of index a to the classification problem of the pair of its minimal resolution and $(-a)$ times the discriminant divisor. We call such pair an *a-basic pair* (see Section 3.1). Next, by contracting (-1)-curves very carefully, we get

an *a-fundamental multiplet* from an a-basic pair (see Section 3.2). See also the flowcharts in [FY14, §1]. From the assumption $(-K_S^2) \geq 2a$, the structure of the associated a-fundamental multiplet has very special structure. Thus we can get the multiplets in Section 4.1.

Acknowledgments. The author is partially supported by a JSPS Fellowship for Young Scientists.

Notation and terminology. We work in the category of algebraic (separated and of finite type) scheme over a fixed algebraically closed field $\Bbbk$ of arbitrary characteristic. A *variety* means a reduced and irreducible algebraic scheme. A *surface* means a two-dimensional variety.

For a normal variety X, we say that D is a $\mathbb{Q}$-*divisor* (resp. *divisor* or $\mathbb{Z}$-*divisor*) if D is a finite sum $D = \sum a_i D_i$ where D_i are prime divisors and $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ (resp. $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$). For a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $D = \sum a_i D_i$, the value a_i is denoted by $\operatorname{coeff}_{D_i} D$ and set $\operatorname{coeff} D := \{a_i\}_i$. For an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor or a scheme D on X, let $|D|$ be the support of D. A normal variety X is called *log-terminal* if the canonical divisor K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and the discrepancy $\operatorname{discrep}(X)$ of X is bigger than -1 (see [KM98, §2.3]). For a proper birational morphism $f\colon Y \to X$ between normal varieties such that both K_X and K_Y are $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, we set

$$K_{Y/X} := \sum_{E_0 \subset Y \ f\text{-exceptional}} a(E_0, X) E_0,$$

where $a(E_0, X)$ is the discrepancy of E_0 with respects to X (see [KM98, §2.3]). (We note that if aK_X and aK_Y are Cartier for $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, then $aK_{Y/X}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-divisor.)

For a nonsingular surface S and a projective curve C which is a closed subvariety of S, the curve C is called a $(-n)$-*curve* if C is a nonsingular rational curve and $(C^2) = -n$. For a birational map $M \dashrightarrow S$ between normal surfaces and for a curve $C \subset S$, the strict transform of C on M is denoted by C^M. If the birational map is of the form $M_i \dashrightarrow M_j$, then the strict transform of $C \subset M_j$ on M_i is denoted by C^i.

Let S be a nonsingular surface and let $D = \sum a_j D_j$ be an effective divisor on S ($a_j > 0$) such that $|D|$ is simple normal crossing and D_i, D_j are intersected at most one point. (It is sufficient in our situation.) The *dual graph* of D is defined as follows. A vertex corresponds to a component D_j. Let v_j be the vertex corresponds to D_j. The v_i and v_j are joined by a (simple) line if and only if D_i, D_j are intersected. In the dual graphs of divisors, a vertex corresponding to $(-n)$-curve is expressed as $\textcircled{n}$. On the other hand, an arbitrary irreducible curve is expressed by the symbol $\oslash$ when it is not necessary a $(-n)$-curve.

Let $\mathbb{F}_n \to \mathbb{P}^1$ be a Hirzebruch surface $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}(n))$ of degree n with the $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration. A section $\sigma \subset \mathbb{F}_n$ with $(\sigma^2) = -n$ is called a *minimal section*. If $n > 0$, then such σ is unique. We usually denote a fiber of $\mathbb{F}_n \to \mathbb{P}^1$ by l.

For a real number t, let $\lfloor t \rfloor$ be the greatest integer not grater than t.

2. Elimination of subschemes

In this section, we recall the results in [Nak07, §2] (see also [Fuj14, §2]). Let X be a nonsingular surface and Δ be a zero-dimensional subscheme of X. The defining ideal sheaf of Δ is denoted by $\mathcal{I}_\Delta$.

Definition 2.1. Let P be a point of Δ.

(1) Let $\nu_P(\Delta) := \max\{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \,|\, \mathcal{I}_\Delta \subset \mathfrak{m}_P^\nu\}$, where $\mathfrak{m}_P$ is the maximal ideal sheaf in $\mathcal{O}_X$ defining P. If $\nu_P(\Delta) = 1$ for any $P \in \Delta$, then we say that Δ *satisfies the* $(\nu 1)$*-condition*.
(2) The *multiplicity* $\operatorname{mult}_P \Delta$ of Δ at P is given by the length of the Artinian local ring $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta,P}$.
(3) The *degree* $\deg \Delta$ of Δ is given by $\sum_{P \in \Delta} \operatorname{mult}_P \Delta$.

Definition 2.2. Assume that Δ satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition. Let $V \to X$ be the blowing up along Δ. The *elimination* of Δ is the birational projective morphism $\psi\colon Y \to X$ which is defined as the composition of the minimal resolution $Y \to V$ of V and the morphism $V \to X$. For any divisor E on X and for any positive integer s, we set $E^{\Delta,s} := \psi^* E - sK_{Y/X}$.

Proposition 2.3 ([Nak07, Proposition 2.9])**.** (1) *Assume that the subscheme Δ satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition and let $\psi\colon Y \to X$ be the elimination of Δ. Then the anti-canonical divisor $-K_Y$ is ψ-nef. More precisely, for any $P \in \Delta$ with $\operatorname{mult}_P \Delta = k$, the set-theoretic inverse image $\psi^{-1}(P)$ is the straight chain $\sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma_{P,j}$ of nonsingular rational curves and the dual graph of $\psi^{-1}(P)$ is the following:*

(2) *Conversely, for a proper birational morphism $\psi\colon Y \to X$ between nonsingular surfaces such that $-K_Y$ is ψ-nef, the morphism ψ is the elimination of Δ which satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition defined by the ideal $\mathcal{I}_\Delta := \psi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(-K_{Y/X})$.*

Definition 2.4. Under the assumption of Proposition 2.3 (1), we always denote the exceptional curves of ψ over P by $\Gamma_{P,1}, \dots, \Gamma_{P,k}$. The order is determined as Proposition 2.3 (1).

Now we see some examples of the dual graphs of $E^{\Delta,s}$.

Example 2.5 ([Fuj14, Example 2.5])**.** Assume that Δ satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition such that $|\Delta| = \{P\}$. Let $E = eC$ be a divisor on X such that $P \in C$ and C is nonsingular. Let $m := \deg \Delta$ and $k := \mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta \cap C)$. Then we have

$$E^{\Delta,s} = eC^Y + \sum_{i=1}^{k} i(e-s)\Gamma_{P,i} + \sum_{i=k+1}^{m} (ek - si)\Gamma_{P,i},$$

where $\psi\colon Y \to X$ is the elimination of Δ. Moreover, the dual graph of $\psi^{-1}(E)$ is the following:



Example 2.6. [Fuj14, Example 2.6] Assume that Δ satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition such that $|\Delta| = \{P\}$. Let $E = e_1C_1 + e_2C_2$ be a non-zero effective divisor such that C_1 and C_2 are nonsingular and intersect transversally at a unique point $P = C_1 \cap C_2$. Let $m := \deg \Delta$ and $k_j := \mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta \cap C_j)$. By [Nak07, Lemma 2.12], we may assume that $k_1 = 1$. Then we have

$$E^{\Delta,s} = e_1C_1^Y + e_2C_2^Y + \sum_{i=1}^{k_2}(i(e_2-s)+e_1)\Gamma_{P,i} + \sum_{i=k_2+1}^{m} (e_1+k_2e_2-is)\Gamma_{P,i},$$

where $\psi\colon Y \to X$ is the elimination of Δ. Moreover, the dual graph of $\psi^{-1}(E)$ is the following:



3. Log del Pezzo surfaces

We define the notion of log del Pezzo surfaces, a-basic pairs, and a-fundamental multiplets, and we see the correspondence among them.

3.1. **Log del Pezzo surfaces and a-basic pairs.**

Definition 3.1. (1) A normal projective surface S is called a *log del Pezzo surface* if S is log-terminal and the anti-canonical divisor $-K_S$ is an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier divisor.

(2) Let S be a log del Pezzo surface. The *index* of S is defined as $\min\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} | -aK_S \text{ is Cartier}\}$.

Remark 3.2. Any log del Pezzo surface is a rational surface by [Nak07, Proposition 3.6]. In particular, the Picard group $\mathrm{Pic}(S)$ of S is a finitely generated and torsion-free Abelian group.

Definition 3.3 ([FY14, Definition 3.3])**.** Fix $a \geq 2$. A pair (M, E_M) is called an *a-basic pair* if the following conditions are satisfied:

($\mathcal{C}1$) M is a nonsingular projective rational surface.
($\mathcal{C}2$) E_M is a nonzero effective divisor on M such that $\mathrm{coeff}\, E_M \subset \{1, \ldots, a-1\}$ and $|E_M|$ is simple normal crossing.
($\mathcal{C}3$) A divisor $L_M \sim -aK_M - E_M$ (called the *fundamental divisor* of (M, E_M)) satisfies that $K_M + L_M$ is nef and $(K_M + L_M \cdot L_M) > 0$.
($\mathcal{C}4$) For any irreducible component $C \leq E_M$, $(L_M \cdot C) = 0$ holds.

We see the correspondence between log del Pezzo surfaces and a-basic pairs.

Proposition 3.4 ([FY14, Proposition 3.4])**.** *Fix $a \geq 2$.*

(1) *Let S be a non-Gorenstein log del Pezzo surface such that $-aK_S$ is Cartier. Let $\alpha\colon M \to S$ be the minimal resolution of S and let $E_M := -aK_{M/S}$. Then (M, E_M) is an a-basic pair and the divisor $\alpha^*(-aK_S)$ is the fundamental divisor of (M, E_M).*
(2) *Let (M, E_M) be an a-basic pair and L_M be the fundamental divisor of (M, E_M). Then there exists a projective and birational morphism $\alpha\colon M \to S$ such that S is a non-Gorenstein log del Pezzo surface with $-aK_S$ Cartier and $L_M \sim \alpha^*(-aK_S)$ holds. Moreover, the morphism α is the minimal resolution of S.*

In particular, under the correspondence between S and (M, E_M), we have $a(-K_S^2) = (1/a)(L_M^2)$, where L_M is the fundamental divisor.

Definition 3.5. Let $a \geq 2$.

(1) For a log del Pezzo surface S of index a, the corresponding a-basic pair (M, E_M) which is given in Proposition 3.4 (1) is called the *associated a-basic pair* of S.
(2) For an a-basic pair (M, E_M), the corresponding log del Pezzo surface S which is given in Proposition 3.4 (2) is called the *associated log del Pezzo surface* of (M, E_M). We note that a is divisible by the index of S.

We discuss that when the log del Pezzo surface S associated to an a-basic pair (M, E_M) is of index a.

Lemma 3.6. *Let S be a log del Pezzo surface of index $a \geq 2$ and (M, E_M) be the associated a-basic pair. Pick any irreducible component $C \leq E_M$ and set $e := \operatorname{coeff}_C E_M$ and $d := -(C^2)$. Then $2 \leq d \leq 2a/(a-e)$. In particular, $d \leq 2a$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, $d \geq 2$. We know that $-ed \leq (E_M \cdot C) = (-aK_M \cdot C) = a(2-d)$ since $(L_M \cdot C) = 0$, where L_M is the fundamental divisor. Thus $d \leq 2a/(a-e)$. Since $e \leq a-1$, we have $d \leq 2a$. □

Corollary 3.7. *Let (M, E_M) be an a-basic pair with $a \geq 2$. Assume that there exists an irreducible component $C \leq E_M$ such that either $(C^2) < -a$, or $\operatorname{coeff}_C E_M$ and a are coprime. Then the associated log del Pezzo surface S is of index a.*

Proof. Let a' be the index of S. Then $a' > 1$ and a is divisible by a'. Moreover, $\operatorname{coeff}_C E_M$ is divisible by a/a'. Thus the assertion follows from Lemma 3.6. □

3.2. **a-fundamental multiplets.** In order to determine a-basic pairs, we define the notion of a-fundamental multiplets given in [FY14, §1].

Definition 3.8. Fix $a \geq 2$ and $1 \leq i \leq a-1$. We define the following notion inductively. A multiplet $(M_i, E_i; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_i)$ is called an *a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet of length i* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- ($\mathcal{F}1$) M_i is a nonsingular projective rational surface and E_i is a nonzero effective divisor on M_i.
- ($\mathcal{F}2$) A divisor $L_i \sim -aK_{M_i} - E_i$ (called the *fundamental divisor*) satisfies that $iK_{M_i} + L_i$ is nef and $((i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i \cdot \gamma) \geq 0$ for any (-1)-curve $\gamma \subset M_i$.
- ($\mathcal{F}3$) $\Delta_i \subset M_i$ is a zero-dimensional subscheme which satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition.
- ($\mathcal{F}4$) Let $\pi_i \colon M_{i-1} \to M_i$ be the elimination of Δ_i and $E_{i-1} := E_i^{\Delta_i, a-i}$. Then the following holds:
  - If $i = 1$, then (M_0, E_0) is an a-basic pair.
  - If $i \geq 2$, then $(M_{i-1}, E_{i-1}; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{i-1})$ is an a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet of length $i-1$.

Moreover, if $(i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i$ is not nef, then we call the multiplet an *a-fundamental multiplet* of length i.

Definition 3.9. (1) Let $(M_i, E_i; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_i)$ be an a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet. We call the a-basic pair (M_0, E_0) (constructed from the multiplet inductively) as the *associated a-basic pair*.

(2) We sometimes call a-basic pairs as *a-pseudo-fundamental multiplets of length zero* for convenience.

The following proposition is important.

Proposition 3.10. *Fix $a \geq 2$ and $0 \leq i \leq a-1$. Let $(M_i, E_i; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_i)$ be an a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet of length i, $\pi_j \colon M_{j-1} \to M_j$ be the elimination of Δ_j, $E_{j-1} := E_j^{\Delta_j, a-j}$ and L_j be the fundamental divisor of $(M_j, E_j; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_j)$ for any $0 \leq j \leq i$.*

(1) *Assume that $(i+1)K_{M_i}+L_i$ is nef. Then $i \leq a-2$ and $iK_{M_i}+L_i$ is nef and big. Moreover, there exists a projective and birational morphism $\pi_{i+1} \colon M_i \to M_{i+1}$ between nonsingular surfaces such that the following conditions are satisfied:*
   - *There exists a zero-dimensional subscheme $\Delta_{i+1} \subset M_{i+1}$ which satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition such that π_{i+1} is the elimination of Δ_{i+1}.*
   - *Set $E_{i+1} := (\pi_{i+1})_* E_i$ and $L_{i+1} := (\pi_{i+1})_* L_i$. Then $E_i = E_{i+1}^{\Delta_{i+1}, a-i-1}$ and $L_i = L_{i+1}^{\Delta_{i+1}, i+1}$.*
   - *$(M_{i+1}, E_{i+1}; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{i+1})$ is an a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet of length $i+1$ and L_{i+1} is the fundamental divisor.*

(2) *Assume that $(i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i$ is not nef, that is, the multiplet $(M_i, E_i; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_i)$ is an a-fundamental multiplet. Then M_i is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{P}^2$ or $\mathbb{F}_n$, and $((i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i \cdot l) < 0$, where l is a line (if $M_i \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$); a fiber (if $M_i \simeq \mathbb{F}_n$).*

(3) *L_i is nef and big. Moreover, we have the following:*
   - *$(L_i \cdot E_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} j(a-j) \deg \Delta_j$.*
   - *$(K_{M_i} + L_i \cdot L_i) - (K_{M_0} + L_0 \cdot L_0) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} j(j-1) \deg \Delta_j$.*
   - *$(L_i \cdot C) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} j \deg(\Delta_j \cap C^j)$ for any nonsingular component $C \leq E_i$.*
   - *$(1/a)(L_0^2) = (-K_{M_i} \cdot L_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{i} j \deg \Delta_j$.*

Proof. We can assume by induction on i that L_{i-1} is nef and big and $L_{i-1} = L_i^{\Delta_i, i}$ if $i \geq 1$. Thus L_i is nef and big.

(1) Assume that $(i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i$ is nef. Since $a((i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i) \sim -(i+1)E_i + (a-(i+1))L_i$, we must have $a-(i+1) > 0$. Moreover, since $(i+1)(iK_{M_i} + L_i) = i((i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i) + L_i$, $iK_{M_i} + L_i$ is nef and big. From now on, we run $((i+2)K_{M_i} + L_i)$-minimal model program and let $\pi_{i+1} \colon M_i \to M_{i+1}$ be the composition of the morphisms in the program. More precisely, we obtain the morphism π_{i+1} which is the composition of monoidal transforms such that each exceptional (-1)-curve intersects the strict transform of $(i+2)K_{M_i} + L_i$ negatively. Furthermore, $((i+2)K_{M_{i+1}} + L_{i+1} \cdot \gamma) \geq 0$ holds for any (-1)-curve

$\gamma \subset M_{i+1}$. Since $(i+1)K_{M_i} + L_i$ is nef, any (-1)-curve in each step of the monoidal transform intersects the strict transform of $(i+1)K_{M_i}+L_i$ trivially. Thus $(i+1)K_{M_i}+L_i = \pi_{i+1}^*((i+1)K_{M_{i+1}}+L_{i+1})$. In particular, $-K_{M_i}$ is π_{i+1}-nef. By Proposition 2.3, there exists a zero-dimensional subscheme $\Delta_{i+1} \subset M_{i+1}$ which satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition such that π_{i+1} is the elimination of Δ_{i+1}. Furthermore, we have $L_i = L_{i+1}^{\Delta_{i+1},i+1}$ and $E_i = E_{i+1}^{\Delta_{i+1},a-i-1}$. Since each step of the $((i+2)K_{M_i}+L_i)$-minimal model program can be seen as a step of $(-E_i)$-minimal model program, E_{i+1} is nonzero effective. Thus the assertion (1) follows.

(2) Follows from [Mor82, Theorem 2.1].

(3) We know that $(-K_{M_i} \cdot L_i) = (-K_{M_{i-1}} \cdot L_{i-1}) - i(K^2_{M_{i-1}/K_{M_i}}) = (-K_{M_{i-1}} \cdot L_{i-1}) + i \deg \Delta_i$. Thus we have $(1/a)(L_0^2) = (-K_{M_i} \cdot L_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{i} j \deg \Delta_j$ by induction on i. Other assertions follow similarly. □

As a direct corollary of Proposition 3.10 (1), we have the following.

Corollary 3.11. *Fix $a \geq 2$. Let (M, E_M) be an a-basic pair. Then there exists a positive integer $1 \leq b \leq a-1$ and an a-fundamental multiplet $(M_b, E_b; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_b)$ of length b such that the associated a-basic pair is isomorphic to (M, E_M).*

From the next proposition, we can replace an a-fundamental multiplet with another one. The proof is same as that of [Nak07, Proposition 4.4]. See also [Fuj14, Proposition 3.14] and [FY14, Theorem 3.12].

Proposition 3.12. *Fix $a \geq 2$ and $1 \leq b < a$. Let $(M_b, E_b; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_b)$ be an a-fundamental multiplet of length b and L_b be the fundamental divisor. Assume that $M_b = \mathbb{F}_n$ and $bK_{M_b}+L_b$ is not big and not trivial. Then there exists an a-fundamental multiplet $(M_b', E_b'; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{b-1}, \Delta_b')$ such that the associated a-pseudo-fundamental multiplets of length $b-1$ are same, $M_b' = \mathbb{F}_{n'}$ for some $n' \geq 0$ and $\Delta_b' \cap \sigma' = \emptyset$, where $\sigma' \subset \mathbb{F}_{n'}$ is a section with $(\sigma'^2) = -n'$.*

The next proposition is useful to know when a given multiplet is an a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet.

Proposition 3.13. *Fix $1 \leq i < a$. Let X be a nonsingular projective surface, E be a divisor on X, $L \sim -aK_X - E$ be a divisor such that iK_X+L is nef, $\Delta \subset X$ be a zero-dimensional subscheme which satisfies the $(\nu 1)$-condition, $\psi\colon Y \to X$ be the elimination of Δ, $L_Y := L^{\Delta,i}$ and $E_Y := E^{\Delta,a-i}$. If E_Y is effective and $(L_Y \cdot C) \geq 0$ for any irreducible component $C \leq E_Y$, then $jK_Y + L_Y$ is nef for any $0 \leq j \leq i$.*

Proof. Assume that there exists an integer $0 \leq j \leq i$ such that $jK_Y + L_Y$ is non-nef. Since $iK_Y + L_Y = \psi^*(iK_X + L)$, we have $j < i$. Pick

an irreducible curve $B \subset Y$ such that $(jK_Y + L_Y \cdot B) < 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> (a-i)(jK_Y + L_Y \cdot B) \\ &= (a-j)(iK_Y + L_Y \cdot B) + (i-j)(E_Y \cdot B) \geq (i-j)(E_Y \cdot B). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $B \leq E_Y$. Hence $(L_Y \cdot B) \geq 0$. However,

$$0 > i(jK_Y + L_Y \cdot B) = j(iK_Y + L_Y \cdot B) + (i-j)(L_Y \cdot B) \geq 0,$$

which leads to a contradiction. □

3.3. **Local properties.** In this section, we fix the following notation: Let $1 \leq i < a$, $(M_i, E_i; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_i)$ be an a-pseudo-fundamental multiplet of length i, L_i be its fundamental divisor, $\pi_j \colon M_{j-1} \to M_j$ be the elimination of Δ_j, $E_{j-1} := E_j^{\Delta_j, a-j}$ and $L_{j-1} := L_j^{\Delta_j, j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq i$. Moreover, we fix a point $P \in \Delta_i$.

Lemma 3.14. (1) *The multiplicity of E_i at P is bigger than or equal to $a - i$.*
(2) *Pick any π_i-exceptional curve $\Gamma \subset M_{i-1}$. If $(\Gamma^2) = -1$, then $(L_{i-1} \cdot \Gamma) = i$. If $(\Gamma^2) = -2$, then $(L_{i-1} \cdot \Gamma) = 0$.*
(3) *Assume that $E_i = eC$ around P, where $P \in C$ and C is nonsingular and $e \leq a - i$. Then $e = a - i$, $\Delta_i \subset C$ around P and E_{i-1} is the strict transform of E_i around over P.*
(4) *Assume that $E_i = (a-1)C$ around P, where $P \in C$ and C is nonsingular. If $2i \leq a+1$, $\operatorname{mult}_P(\Delta_i \cap C) = 1$ and $\operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_i \geq 2$, then $2i = a + 1$ and $\operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_i = 2$.*

Proof. (1) The value $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,1}} E_{i-1}$ must be nonnegative.
(2) Follows from the fact $(iK_{M_{i-1}} + L_{i-1} \cdot \Gamma) = 0$.
(3) Set $m := \operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_i$ and $k := \operatorname{mult}_P(\Delta_i \cap C)$. By Example 2.5, $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,1}} E_{i-1} = e - (a - i)$. Thus $e = a - i$. If $k < m$, then $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,m}} E_{i-1} = (a-i)(k-m) < 0$ by Example 2.5, a contradiction.
(4) We know that $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,2}} E_{i-1} = a - 1 - 2(a-i) \leq 0$ by Example 2.5. Thus $2i = a + 1$ and $\operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_i = 2$. □

Lemma 3.15. *Assume that $a \geq 4$, $i = 1$, $1 \leq e \leq 2$, $E_1 = (a-1)C_1 + eC_2$ around P, where C_1, C_2 are nonsingular and intersect transversally at P. Then $e = 2$ and $\operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_1 = \operatorname{mult}_P(\Delta_1 \cap C_2)$. Moreover, $(a, \operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_1) = (5, 2)$ or $(4, 3)$.*

Proof. Set $m := \operatorname{mult}_P \Delta_1$ and $k_j := \operatorname{mult}_P(\Delta_1 \cap C_j)$. By Lemma 3.6, $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,m}} E_0 = 0$. If $k_1 > 1$, then $k_2 = 1$ by Example 2.6. However, if $m = k_1$, then $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,m}} E_0 = e$; if $m > k_1$, then $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,k_1+1}} E_0 = e - (a-1) < 0$. This leads to a contradiction. Thus $k_1 = 1$. If $m > k_2$, then $\operatorname{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,m}} E_0 = a - 1 + ek_2 - m(a-1) \leq 2k_2 - k_2(a-1) < 0$ by Example

2.6. This leads to a contradiction. Thus $m = k_2$. Again by Example 2.6, $\mathrm{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,m}} E_0 = m(e+1-a)+a-1$. Thus $m = (a-1)/(a-(e+1))$. Thus $e = 2$. Moreover, $(a, m) = (5, 2)$ or $(4, 3)$. □

Lemma 3.16. *Assume that $i \geq 2$, $\Delta_j = \emptyset$ for any $1 \leq j < i$, $E_i = (a-i+1)C$ around P and $\mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_i < 2(a-i+1)$, where $P \in C$ and C is nonsingular. Then $\mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_i = a-i+1$ and $\mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta_i \cap C) = a-i$.*

Proof. Set $m := \mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_i$ and $k := \mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta_i \cap C)$. By Lemma 3.6, $E_{i-1}(= E_0)$ does not contain any (-1)-curve. Thus $0 = \mathrm{coeff}_{\Gamma_{P,m}} E_{i-1} = (a-i+1)k-(a-i)m$ by Example 2.5. Thus the assertion follows. □

4. Examples

In this section, we see the a-fundamental multiplets and the log del Pezzo surfaces which appeared in Section 1.

4.1. Special a-fundamental multiplets.

Example 4.1. Let $a \geq 2$ and $b := \lfloor (a+1)/2 \rfloor$. We consider the following a-fundamental multiplets $(M_b, E_b; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_b)$ of length b:

- $\langle \mathrm{O} \rangle_a$: $M_b = \mathbb{F}_{2a}$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma$, $\Delta_b = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_1 = \emptyset$.
- $\langle \mathrm{I} \rangle_a$: $M_b = \mathbb{F}_{2a-1}$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma$, $\Delta_b = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_2 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_1 \subset \sigma^1$ with $\deg \Delta_1 = 1$.
- $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$: $M_b = \mathbb{F}_{2a-2}$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma$, $\Delta_b = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_2 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_1 \subset \sigma^1$ with $\deg \Delta_1 = 2$.
- $\langle \mathrm{III} \rangle_a$: $M_b = \mathbb{F}_{2a-3}$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma$, $\Delta_b = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_2 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_1 \subset \sigma^1$ with $\deg \Delta_1 = 3$.
- $\langle \mathrm{IV} \rangle_a$: $M_b = \mathbb{F}_{2a-4}$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma$, $\Delta_b = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_2 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_1 \subset \sigma^1$ with $\deg \Delta_1 = 4$.

By Proposition 3.13, it is easy to check that these multiplets are exactly a-fundamental multiplets. Moreover, all of the associated a-basic pairs (M_0, E_0) satisfy that $E_0 = (a-1)\sigma^0$ and $((\sigma^0)^2) = -2a$. Thus the associated log del Pezzo surfaces S are of index a by Corollary 3.7. Furthermore, the value $(-K_S^2)$ is equal to $(2a^2+4a+2)/a$ (if $\langle \mathrm{O} \rangle_a$), $(2a^2+3a+2)/a$ (if $\langle \mathrm{I} \rangle_a$), $(2a^2+2a+2)/a$ (if $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$), $(2a^2+a+2)/a$ (if $\langle \mathrm{III} \rangle_a$), $(2a^2+2)/a$ (if $\langle \mathrm{IV} \rangle_a$) by Proposition 3.10 (3).

Example 4.2. We consider the case $(a, b) = (5, 3)$. Consider the following 5-fundamental multiplet $(M_3, E_3; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3)$ of length three:

- $\langle \mathrm{A} \rangle_5$: $M_3 = \mathbb{F}_8$, $E_3 = 4\sigma + 2l$, $\Delta_3 \subset l \setminus \sigma$ with $\deg \Delta_3 = 2$, $\Delta_2 = \emptyset$ and $\Delta_1 = \emptyset$.

By Proposition 3.13, it is easy to check that the multiplet is exactly a 5-fundamental multiplet. Moreover, the associated 5-basic pair (M_0, E_0) satisfies that $E_0 = 4\sigma^0 + 2l^0$ and the dual graph of E_0 is the following:



Furthermore, the associated log del Pezzo surface S of index five satisfies that the value $(-K_S^2)$ is equal to $54/5$ by Proposition 3.10 (3).

Example 4.3. We consider the case $(a, b) = (4, 2)$. Consider the following 4-fundamental multiplets $(M_2, E_2; \Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ of length two:

- $\langle \mathrm{B} \rangle_4$**:** $M_2 = \mathbb{F}_4$, $E_2 = 3\sigma$, $|\Delta_2| = \{P\}$ with $P \in \sigma$ such that $\deg \Delta_2 = 3$, $\deg(\Delta_2 \cap \sigma) = 2$ and $\Delta_1 = \emptyset$.
- $\langle \mathrm{C} \rangle_4$**:** $M_2 = \mathbb{F}_5$, $E_2 = 3\sigma + 2l$, $\deg \Delta_2 = 1$ with $\Delta_2 \subset l \setminus \sigma$, $|\Delta_1| = \{P\}$ such that $P = \sigma^1 \cap l^1$ and $\deg \Delta_1 = \deg(\Delta_1 \cap l^1) = 3$.

By Proposition 3.13, it is easy to check that these multiplets are exactly 4-fundamental multiplets. Moreover, the associated 4-basic pairs (M_0, E_0) satisfy the following:

The case $\langle \mathrm{B} \rangle_4$**:** $E_0 = 3\sigma^0 + 2\Gamma^0_{P,2} + \Gamma^0_{P,1}$ and the dual graph of E_0 is the following:



The case $\langle \mathrm{C} \rangle_4$**:** $E_0 = 3\sigma^0 + 2\Gamma_{P,1} + \Gamma_{P,2} + 2l^0$ and the dual graph of E_0 is the following:



Thus the associated log del Pezzo surfaces S are of index 4 by Corollary 3.7. Furthermore, the value $(-K_S^2)$ is equal to 8 in any case by Proposition 3.10 (3).

Remark 4.4. Let S be a log del Pezzo surface of index a such that $(-K_S^2) \geq 2a$.

(1) Assume that $a = 2$. Then S is isomorphic to the log del Pezzo surface associated to the fundamental triplet in the sense of [Nak07] whose type is one of the following:
- $[4; 1, 0]_0 \quad ((-K_S^2) = 9)$,
- $[3; 1, 0]_0 \quad ((-K_S^2) = 8)$,
- $[2; 1, 0]_0 \quad ((-K_S^2) = 7)$,
- $[1; 1, 0]_0$, $[3; 1, 1]_+ \quad ((-K_S^2) = 6)$,
- $[0; 1, 0]_0$, $[2; 1, 1]_+(a, b) \quad ((-K_S^2) = 5)$,
- $[1; 1, 1]_0$, $[1; 1, 1]_+(a, b) \quad ((-K_S^2) = 4)$.

We note that the types $[4;1,0]_0$, $[3;1,0]_0$, $[2;1,0]_0$, $[1;1,0]_0$, $[0;1,0]_0$ in [Nak07] are nothing but the types $\langle \mathrm{O}\rangle_2$, $\langle \mathrm{I}\rangle_2$, $\langle \mathrm{II}\rangle_2$, $\langle \mathrm{III}\rangle_2$, $\langle \mathrm{IV}\rangle_2$ in Example 4.1, respectively.

(2) Assume that $a = 3$. Then S is isomorphic to the log del Pezzo surface associated to the bottom tetrad in the sense of [FY14] whose type is one of the following:
- $[\mathbf{6;2,0}] \quad ((-K_S^2) = 32/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{5;2,0}] \quad ((-K_S^2) = 29/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{4;2,0}] \quad ((-K_S^2) = 26/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{3;1,0}] \quad ((-K_S^2) = 25/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{5;2,1}]_1 \quad ((-K_S^2) = 8)$,
- $[\mathbf{3;2,0}] \quad ((-K_S^2) = 23/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{2;1,0}]$, $[\mathbf{4;2,1}]_{1B} \quad ((-K_S^2) = 22/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{4;2,1}]_{1A} \quad ((-K_S^2) = 7)$,
- $[\mathbf{4;2,2}]_{1F} \quad ((-K_S^2) = 20/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{1;1,0}]$, $[\mathbf{2;2,0}]$, $[\mathbf{3;2,1}]_{1B}$, $[\mathbf{4;2,2}]_{1E} \quad ((-K_S^2) = 19/3)$,
- $[\mathbf{3;2,1}]_{1A}$, $[\mathbf{4;2,2}]_{1C}$, $[\mathbf{4;2,2}]_{1D}, \quad ((-K_S^2) = 6)$.

We note that the types $[\mathbf{6;2,0}]$, $[\mathbf{5;2,0}]$, $[\mathbf{4;2,0}]$, $[\mathbf{3;2,0}]$, $[\mathbf{2;2,0}]$ in [FY14] are nothing but the types $\langle \mathrm{O}\rangle_3$, $\langle \mathrm{I}\rangle_3$, $\langle \mathrm{II}\rangle_3$, $\langle \mathrm{III}\rangle_3$, $\langle \mathrm{IV}\rangle_3$ in Example 4.1, respectively. Moreover, the log del Pezzo surface of index three associated to the bottom tetrad of type $[\mathbf{3;1,0}]$ is isomorphic to the weighted projective plane $\mathbb{P}(1,1,3)$.

4.2. **Special log del Pezzo surfaces.** In this section, we determine the log del Pezzo surfaces associated to the a-fundamental multiplets of types $\langle \mathrm{O}\rangle_a$, $\langle \mathrm{I}\rangle_a$ and $\langle \mathrm{II}\rangle_a$. We freely use the notation of the toric geometry in this section. See [Ful93] for example. We fix a lattice $N := \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus 2}$ and set $N_{\mathbb{R}} := N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} (\simeq \mathbb{R}^{\oplus 2})$.

Example 4.5. Fix $a \geq 2$. It is well-known that the weighted projective plane $\mathbb{P}(1,1,2a)$ is a log del Pezzo surface of index a; the associated a-basic pair is equal to $(\mathbb{F}_{2a}, (a-1)\sigma)$. Thus the log del Pezzo surface associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of type $\langle \mathrm{O}\rangle_a$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(1,1,2a)$.

Example 4.6. Fix $a \geq 2$. Let $\Sigma_{\mathrm{I},a}$ be the complete fan in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the set of the generators of one-dimensional cones in $\Sigma_{\mathrm{I},a}$ is

$$\{(1,0), (0,1), (-1, -2a+1), (-1,-2a)\}.$$

Let $S_{\mathrm{I},a}$ be the projective toric surface associated to the fan $\Sigma_{\mathrm{I},a}$. Then the minimal resolution $M_{\mathrm{I},a}$ of $S_{\mathrm{I},a}$ corresponds to the complete fan $\Sigma'_{\mathrm{I},a}$ such that the set of the generators of one-dimensional cones in $\Sigma'_{\mathrm{I},a}$ is

$$\{(1,0), (0,1), (-1, -2a+1), (-1,-2a), (0,-1)\}.$$

Moreover, the divisor $-aK_{M_{\mathrm{I},a}/S_{\mathrm{I},a}}$ is equal to $(a-1)V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1))$, where $V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1))$ is the torus-invariant prime divisor associated to the cone $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1) \in \Sigma'_{\mathrm{I},a}$. We note that $M_{\mathrm{I},a}$ is isomorphic to the variety $\mathbb{F}_{2a-1}$ blowing upped along a point on σ. Moreover, $V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1))$ corresponds to the strict transform of $\sigma \subset \mathbb{F}_{2a-1}$. Therefore the log del Pezzo surface associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of type $\langle \mathrm{I} \rangle_a$ is isomorphic to $S_{\mathrm{I},a}$.

Example 4.7. Fix $a \geq 2$. Let $\Sigma_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ be the complete fan in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the set of the generators of one-dimensional cones in $\Sigma_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ is

$$\{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,-2a+2),(-1,-2a)\}.$$

Let $S_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ be the projective toric surface associated to the fan $\Sigma_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$. Then the minimal resolution $M_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ of $S_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ corresponds to the complete fan $\Sigma'_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ such that the set of the generators of one-dimensional cones in $\Sigma'_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$ is

$$\{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,-2a+2),(-1,-2a+1),(-1,-2a),(0,-1)\}.$$

Moreover, the divisor $-aK_{M_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}/S_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}}$ is equal to $(a-1)V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1))$. We note that the pair $(M_{\mathrm{II}_1,a},(a-1)V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1)))$ is isomorphic to the a-basic pair associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of type $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$ such that $\#|\Delta_1| = 1$. Therefore the log del Pezzo surface associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of type $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$ such that $\#|\Delta_1| = 1$ is isomorphic to $S_{\mathrm{II}_1,a}$.

Example 4.8. Fix $a \geq 2$. Let $\Sigma_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ be the complete fan in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the set of the generators of one-dimensional cones in $\Sigma_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ is

$$\{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,-2a+2),(-1,-2a+1),(1,-1)\}.$$

Let $S_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ be the projective toric surface associated to the fan $\Sigma_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$. Then the minimal resolution $M_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ of $S_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ corresponds to the complete fan $\Sigma'_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ such that the set of the generators of one-dimensional cones in $\Sigma'_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$ is

$$\{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,-2a+2),(-1,-2a+1),(0,-1),(1,-1)\}.$$

Moreover, the divisor $-aK_{M_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}/S_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}}$ is equal to $(a-1)V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1))$. We note that the pair $(M_{\mathrm{II}_2,a},(a-1)V(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}(0,-1)))$ is isomorphic to the a-basic pair associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of type $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$ such that $\#|\Delta_1| = 2$. Therefore the log del Pezzo surface associated to the a-fundamental multiplet of type $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$ such that $\#|\Delta_1| = 2$ is isomorphic to $S_{\mathrm{II}_2,a}$.

From the arguments in this section, Corollary 1.2 is deduced from Theorem 1.1 immediately.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. From now on, let $a \geq 4$, S be a log del Pezzo surface of index a with $(-K_S^2) \geq 2a$, (M_0, E_0) be the associated a-basic pair, $(M_b, E_b; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_b)$ be an a-fundamental multiplet of length b with $1 \leq b \leq a-1$ such that the associated a-basic pair is equal to (M_0, E_0), and L_b be the fundamental divisor of the multiplet. We remark that the existence of such multiplet is proven in Corollary 3.11. By Proposition 3.12, if $M_b \simeq \mathbb{F}_n$ and $bK_{M_b} + L_b$ is non-big and non-trivial, then we can assume that $\Delta_b \cap \sigma = \emptyset$. We know that $a(-K_S^2) = (-K_{M_b} \cdot L_b) - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i$ by Proposition 3.10 (3).

5.1. **Structure of M_b.** In this section, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *M_b is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_n$ for some $n \geq 0$.*

Proof. Assume not. By Proposition 3.10 (2), we can assume that $M_b = \mathbb{P}^2$. Set $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $L_b \sim hl$, where l is a line. By Proposition 3.10, $h \leq 3b+2$ and $2a^2 \leq a(-K_S^2) = 3h - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 3(3b+2) \leq 3(3a-1)$. Thus $a = 4$, $b = a-1 = 3$, $h = 3b+2 = 11$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 1$. However, $11 = (L_b \cdot E_b) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} i(4-i) \deg \Delta_i \leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^{3} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 4$. This leads to a contradiction. □

Therefore, we can assume that $M_b = \mathbb{F}_n$. Set h_0, $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $L_b \sim h_0\sigma + hl$. Then $E_b \sim (2a - h_0)\sigma + ((n+2)a - h)l$ and $a(-K_S^2) = -nh_0 + 2h_0 + 2h - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i$. We note that $b = \lfloor h_0/2 \rfloor$ by Proposition 3.10 (2). Moreover, $h \geq nh_0$ and $h_0 \geq 1$ since L_b is nef and big. In particular, $0 < h_0 < 2a$.

5.2. **Determine the value h_0.** In this section, we prove that $h_0 = a+1$ and $b = \lfloor (a+1)/2 \rfloor$. To begin with, we see the following claim.

Claim 5.2. *We have $h_0 \geq a+1$.*

Proof. Assume that $h_0 \leq a$. Since $\mathrm{coeff}_\sigma E_b \leq a-1$, we have $h \leq 2a + n(h_0 - 1)$. Since $h \geq nh_0$, this implies that $n \leq 2a$. If $h_0 \leq a-1$, then $a(-K_S^2) \leq -nh_0 + 2h_0 + 4a + 2n(h_0 - 1) \leq (n+2)(a-1) + 4a - 2n \leq 2a^2 - 2$, which leads to a contradiction. Thus $h_0 = a$ (under the assumption $h_0 \leq a$). If $n \leq 2a-5$, then $a(-K_S^2) \leq -na + 2a + 4a + 2n(a-1) = (a-2)n + 6a \leq 2a^2 - 3a + 10$, which leads to a contradiction. Thus $2a-4 \leq n \leq 2a$. In particular, $n \geq a$. Moreover, $h \geq 2a + (a-2)n$ since $h \geq an \geq an + 2(a-n)$. If $h = 2a + (a-2)n$, then $a = n = 4$ and $h = 16$. However, in this case, $a(-K_S^2) \leq -4 \cdot 4 + 2 \cdot 4 + 2 \cdot 16 < 32 = 2 \cdot 4^2$, which leads to a contradiction. Thus we have $h > 2a + (a-2)n$. Since

$E_b \sim a\sigma + ((n+2)a-h)l$, $\mathrm{coeff}_\sigma E_b \leq a-1$ and $(n+2)a-h < 2n$, there exists a section $C \leq E_b$ apart from σ. By Proposition 3.10 (3),

$$\begin{aligned} h &\leq (L_b \cdot C) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg(\Delta_i \cap C^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \\ &= -nh_0 + 2h_0 + 2h - a(-K_S^2) \leq a(2-n) + 2h - 2a^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $h \geq 2a^2 + a(n-2)$. However, we know that $h \leq (n+2)a - n$, which leads to a contradiction. □

By Claim 5.2, $h_0 \geq a+1$. Since E_b is effective, we have $h \leq (n+2)a$. Since $h \geq nh_0$, we have $n \leq 2a/(h_0 - a)$. From now on, we assume that $h_0 \geq a+2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a(-K_S^2) &\leq n(2a-h_0) + 2h_0 + 4a - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \\ &\leq \frac{2h_0^2}{h_0 - a} - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq \frac{2h_0^2}{h_0 - a} \leq (a+2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $a = 4$. In this case, $h_0 = 6$ or 7. Assume that $n \leq 2$. Then $a(-K_S^2) \leq n(2a-h_0)+2h_0+4a-\sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 2(8-h_0)+2h_0+16 = 32$. Thus $n = 2$, $h = (n+2)a = 16$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i = 0$. However, in this case, $(L_b \cdot E_b) = 2(8-h_0)^2 \neq 0$, which leads to a contradiction. Hence $n \geq 3$. Thus $h_0 = 6$, $b = 3$, and $n = 3$ or 4 since $n \leq 2a/(h_0 - a)$. Assume that $h < a(n+2) = 4(n+2)$. Since $a(-K_S^2) = 6(2-n) + 2h - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \geq 32$, we have $h \geq 4(n+2) - 2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 2$. We note that there exists a fiber $l \leq E_b$. By Proposition 3.10 (3), $6 = h_0 = (L_b \cdot l) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg(\Delta_i \cap l^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 2$, which leads to contradiction. Thus h must be equal to $4(n+2)$. In particular, $L_3 \sim 6\sigma + 4(n+2)l$, $E_3 = 2\sigma$, $\sum_{i=1}^{3} i(4-i) \deg \Delta_i = 16 - 4n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{3} i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i) = 8 - 2n$.

Assume that $n = 3$. Then $\Delta_1 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_3 = \emptyset$, $\deg \Delta_2 = 1$ and $\Delta_2 \subset \sigma^2$. Then the associated log del Pezzo surface is isomorphic to $S_{\mathrm{I},2}$ having described in Example 4.6. However, the index of $S_{\mathrm{I},2}$ is equal to two, a contradiction.

Assume that $n = 4$. Then $\Delta_1 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_2 = \emptyset$ and $\Delta_3 = \emptyset$. then the associated log del Pezzo surface is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)$. However, the index of $\mathbb{P}(1,1,4)$ is equal to two (see Example 4.5), a contradiction.

Consequently, we have $h_0 = a+1$ and $b = \lfloor h_0/2 \rfloor = \lfloor (a+1)/2 \rfloor$.

5.3. **Determine the values h and n.** In this section, we prove that $h \geq 2a^2 - 2a - 2$ and $2a - 4 \leq n \leq 2a$. To begin with, we see the following claim.

Claim 5.3. *We have $\sigma \leq E_b$.*

Proof. If $\sigma \not\leq E_b$, then $(n+2)a - h \geq (a-1)n$ since $E_b \sim (a-1)\sigma + ((n+2)a - h)l$. However, in this case, $a(-K_S^2) \leq (-n+2)(a+1) + 2(2a+n) = n(1-a) + 6a + 2 \leq 6a + 2 < 2a^2$, which leads to a contradiction. □

By Proposition 3.10 (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -n(a+1) + h &= (L_b \cdot \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \\ &= (-n+2)(a+1) + 2h - a(-K_S^2) \\ &\leq (-n+2)(a+1) + 2h - 2a^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $h \geq 2a^2 - 2a - 2$. Since $(a+1)n \leq h \leq (n+2)a$, we have $2a - 4 \leq n \leq 2a$.

5.4. **The case $h = (n+2)a$.** We consider the case $h = (n+2)a$. In this case, $L_b \sim (a+1)\sigma + (n+2)al$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma$, $2a - n = (L_b \cdot \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i)$, $(a-1)(2a-n) = (L_b \cdot E_b) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i(a-i) \deg \Delta_i$ and $a(-K_S^2) = (n - (2a-4))(a-1) + 2a^2 + 6 - \sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i$. In particular, $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 6 + (n - (2a-4))(a-1)$.

If $\Delta_2 = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_b = \emptyset$, then $\deg \Delta_1 = 2a - n$ and $\Delta_1 \subset \sigma^1$. For the case $n = 2a$ (resp. $n = 2a-1$, $n = 2a-2$, $n = 2a-3$, $n = 2a-4$), the a-fundamental multiplet $(M_b, E_b; \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_b)$ is of type $\langle \mathrm{O} \rangle_a$ (resp. $\langle \mathrm{I} \rangle_a$, $\langle \mathrm{II} \rangle_a$, $\langle \mathrm{III} \rangle_a$, $\langle \mathrm{IV} \rangle_a$).

From now on, we assume that $\Delta_{i_0} \neq \emptyset$ for some $2 \leq i_0 \leq b$. We can assume that $\Delta_j = \emptyset$ for any $j \geq i_0 + 1$. Then $\Delta_{i_0} \cap \sigma^{i_0} \neq \emptyset$. Thus $i_0 \leq 2a - n \leq 4$.

Assume that $i_0 = 4$. Then $2a - n = 4$, $\deg(\Delta_4 \cap \sigma^4) = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i \deg \Delta_i \leq 6$. Let $\Gamma \subset M_3$ be the π_4-exceptional (-1)-curve. Then $\Gamma \leq E_3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{3} i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \Gamma^i) = 4$ by Lemma 3.14. This leads to a contradiction.

Assume that $i_0 = 3$. Since $b \geq 3$, we have $a \geq 5$. Moreover, $\deg(\Delta_3 \cap \sigma^3) = 1$, $\deg(\Delta_2 \cap \sigma^2) = 0$ and $\deg(\Delta_1 \cap \sigma^1) = 2a - n - 3 \leq 1$. If $\deg \Delta_3 \geq 2$ (and $i_0 = 3$), then $a = 5$ and $\deg \Delta_3 = 2$ by Lemma 3.14 (4). However, this contradicts to the assumption $\Delta_b \cap \sigma = \emptyset$. Assume that $\deg \Delta_3 = 1$ (and $i_0 = 3$). Let $\Gamma \subset M_2$ be the π_3-exceptional (-1)-curve. Since $\mathrm{coeff}_\Gamma E_2 = 2$, we have $\Delta_2 = \emptyset$ and $|\Delta_1| = \{P\}$, where

$P = \sigma^1 \cap \Gamma^1$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^2 i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \Gamma^i) = 3$, we have $\mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta_1 \cap \Gamma^1) = 3$. This contradicts to Lemma 3.15 and the fact $a \geq 5$.

Assume that $i_0 = 2$. If $\deg(\Delta_2 \cap \sigma^2) = 1$, then $\deg \Delta_2 = 1$ by Lemma 3.14 (4). In this case, $\mathrm{coeff}_\Gamma E_1 = 1$ and $\deg(\Delta_1 \cap \Gamma) = 2$, where $\Gamma \subset M_1$ is the π_2-exceptional (-1)-curve. For $P := \sigma^1 \cap \Gamma$, $\mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta_1 \cap \Gamma) = 2$ and $\mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta_1 \cap \sigma^1) = 1$. This contradicts to Lemma 3.15. Thus $\deg(\Delta_2 \cap \sigma^2) = 2$. In particular, $n = 2a - 4$ and $\Delta_1 \cap \sigma^1 = \emptyset$. Thus $a = 4$, $|\Delta_2| = \{P\}$ such that $\mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_2 = 3$, $\mathrm{mult}_P(\Delta_2 \cap \sigma^2) = 2$ and $\Delta_1 = \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.16 and the fact $\sum_{i=1}^b i \deg \Delta_i \leq 6$. Then the 4-fundamental multiplet $(M_2, E_2; \Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ is of type $\langle \mathrm{B} \rangle_4$.

5.5. **The case $h = (n+2)a-1$.** We consider the case $h = (n+2)a-1$. In this case, $n \leq 2a-1$, $L_b \sim (a+1)\sigma + ((n+2)a-1)l$, $E_b = (a-1)\sigma + l$, $2a-n-1 = (L_b \cdot \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^b i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i)$, $a+1 = (L_b \cdot l) = \sum_{i=1}^b i \deg(\Delta_i \cap l^i)$, $4a-2-(a-1)(n-(2a-4)) = (L_b \cdot E_b) = \sum_{i=1}^b i(a-i) \deg \Delta_i$ and $a(-K_S^2) = (n-(2a-4))(a-1)+2a^2+4-\sum_{i=1}^b i \deg \Delta_i$. In particular, $\sum_{i=1}^b i \deg \Delta_i \leq 4 + (n-(2a-4))(a-1)$. Hence $n \geq 2a-3$.

Assume that $\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i = \emptyset$ for all $i \geq 2$. Then $\Delta_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \geq 2$. However, by Lemma 3.15, $P \notin \Delta_1$, where $P = \sigma^1 \cap l^1$. Thus $\Delta_1 \cap l^1 = \emptyset$, which leads to a contradiction. Thus $n = 2a-3$, $\deg(\Delta_2 \cap \sigma^2) = 1$ and $\deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i) = 0$ for all $i \neq 2$. Then $|\Delta_2| = \{P\}$ with $P = \sigma^2 \cap l^2$ by Lemma 3.15. Moreover, since E_1 is effective, by Example 2.6, $\deg \Delta_2 = \deg(\Delta_2 \cap l^2)$ and $\deg \Delta_2 \leq 3$ (if $a = 4$); $\deg \Delta_2 \leq 2$ (if $a = 5$); $\deg \Delta_2 = 1$ (if $a \geq 6$), unless $(a, \deg \Delta_2, \deg(\Delta_2 \cap l^2)) = (4, 2, 1)$. If $(a, \deg \Delta_2, \deg(\Delta_2 \cap l^2)) = (4, 2, 1)$, then $\Delta_1 \cap l^1 = \emptyset$, a contradiction. Thus $\deg(\Delta_2 \cap l^2) = \deg \Delta_2$. If $\deg \Delta_2 = 1$, then $\deg \Delta_1 = (a+3)/(a-1)$ and $\deg(\Delta_1 \cap l^1) = a-1$, a contradiction. If $\deg \Delta_2 = 3$, then $\deg(\Delta_1 \cap l^1) = a-5 = -1$, a contradiction. Thus $\deg \Delta_2 = 2$. In this case, $\deg \Delta_1 = (-a+7)/(a-1)$ and $\deg(\Delta_1 \cap l^1) = a-3$. Thus $a = 4$, $\deg \Delta_1 = \deg(\Delta_1 \cap l^1) = 1$. However, in this case, $E_1 = 3\sigma^1 + 2\Gamma_{P,1} + \Gamma_{P,2} + l^1$. Thus $\Delta_1 \cap l^1 = \emptyset$. This leads to a contradiction. Therefore $h \neq (n+2)a-1$.

5.6. **The case $h \leq (n+2)a-2$.** We consider the case $h \leq (n+2)a-2$. In this case, $n \leq 2a-2$. Assume that $h \leq (n+2)a-3$. Then $n = 2a-3$ and $h = 2a^2 - a - 3$ since $h \geq 2a^2 - 2a - 2$. In this case, $E_b \sim (a-1)\sigma + 3l$ and $a(-K_S^2) = 2a^2 + a - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^b i \deg \Delta_i$. Hence there exists a fiber $l \leq E_b$. Thus $a+1 = (L_b \cdot l) = \sum_{i=1}^b i \deg(\Delta_i \cap l^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^b i \deg \Delta_i \leq a-1$, which leads to a contradiction. Thus h must be equal to $(n+2)a-2$. In this case, $L_b \sim (a+1)\sigma + ((n+2)a-2)l$, $E_b \sim (a-1)\sigma + 2l$, $2a-n-2 = (L_b \cdot \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^b i \deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i)$,

$4a-(a-1)(n-(2a-4)) = (L_b \cdot E_b) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i(a-i)\deg \Delta_i$ and $a(-K_S^2) = (n-(2a-4))(a-1)+2a^2+2-\sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i$. In particular, $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i \leq 2+(n-(2a-4))(a-1)$. We note that there exists a fiber $l \leq E_b$ and $a+1 = (L_b \cdot l) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg(\Delta_i \cap l^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i \leq 2a$ for such l. Thus $E_b = (a-1)\sigma + 2l$. Moreover, we have $n \geq 2a-3$. Indeed, if $n = 2a-4$, then $a+1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i \leq 2$, a contradiction.

If $n = 2a-2$, then $0 = (L_b \cdot \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i)$. Since $a-b \geq 2$, we have $a-b = 2$, $\Delta_b \subset l^b \setminus \sigma^b$, $\Delta_1 = \emptyset, \ldots, \Delta_{b-1} = \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.14 (3). In particular, $b+3 = a+1 = b\deg\Delta_b$. Thus $a = 5$, $b = 3$ and $\deg\Delta_3 = 2$. Then the 5-fundamental multiplet $(M_3, E_3; \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3)$ is of type $\langle \mathrm{A} \rangle_5$.

The remaining case is that $n = 2a-3$. Since $a+1 = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg(\Delta_i \cap l^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i \leq a+1$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i = a+1$ and $\Delta_i \subset l^i$ for any i. Since $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg(\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i)$, $\deg(\Delta_1 \cap \sigma^1) = 1$ and $\Delta_i \cap \sigma^i = \emptyset$ for any $i \geq 2$. Set $P = \sigma^1 \cap l^1$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg(\Delta_i \cap l^i) = \sum_{i=1}^{b} i\deg\Delta_i$, we have $P \in \Delta_1$. By Lemma 3.15, either $(a, \mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_1) = (4,3)$ or $(5,2)$ holds. If $(a, \mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_1) = (5,2)$, then $\deg\Delta_2 = 2$ and $\Delta_3 = \emptyset$ since $6 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} i\deg\Delta_i$. However, $\Delta_2 = \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.14 (3), a contradiction. Thus $(a, \mathrm{mult}_P \Delta_1) = (4,3)$. In this case, $\deg\Delta_2 = 1$ since $\sum_{i=1}^{2} i\deg\Delta_i = 5$. Then the 4-fundamental multiplet $(M_2, E_2; \Delta_1, \Delta_2)$ is of type $\langle \mathrm{C} \rangle_4$.

As a consequence, we have complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

References

[Ale94] V. A. Alexeev, *Boundedness and K^2 for log surfaces*, Internat. J. Math. **5** (1994), no. 6, 779–810.

[AM04] V. A. Alexeev and S. Mori, *Bounding singular surfaces of general type*, Algebra, arithmetic and geometry with applications (West Lafayette, IN, 2000), 143–174, Springer, Berlin, 2004.

[AN88] V. A. Alexeev and V. V. Nikulin, *Classification of del Pezzo surfaces with log-terminal singularities of index ≤ 2, involutions on $K3$ surfaces, and reflection groups in Lobachevskiĭ spaces* (Russian), Lectures in mathematics and its applications, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Russian), 51–150, Ross. Akad. Nauk, Inst. Mat. im. Steklova, Moscow, 1988.

[AN89] V. A. Alexeev and V. V. Nikulin, *Classification of del Pezzo surfaces with log-terminal singularities of index ≤ 2 and involutions on $K3$ surfaces* (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **306** (1989), no. 3, 525–528; translation in Soviet Math. Dokl. **39** (1989), no. 3, 507–511.

[AN06] V. A. Alexeev and V. V. Nikulin, *Del Pezzo and $K3$ surfaces*, MSJ Memoirs, **15**. Math. Soc. of Japan, Tokyo, 2006.

[BB92] A. A. Borisov and L. A. Borisov, *Singular toric Fano three-folds*, Math. Sb. **183** (1992), no. 2, 134–141.

[Bor01] A. A. Borisov, *Boundedness of Fano threefolds with log-terminal singularities of given index*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **8** (2001), no. 2, 329–342.

[Bre80] L. Brenton, *On singular complex surfaces with negative canonical bundle, with applications to singular compactifications of* $\mathbb{C}^2$ *and to* 3*-dimensional rational singularities*, Math. Ann. **248** (1980), no. 2, 117–124.

[Dem80] M. Demazure, *Surfaces de del Pezzo II–V*, in *Séminaire sur les Singularités des Surfaces* (eds. M. Demazure, H. Pinkham and B. Teissier), Lecture Notes in Math., **777** (1980), Springer, Berlin, pp. 35–68.

[Fuj14] K. Fujita, *Log del Pezzo surfaces with not small fractional indices*, arXiv:1401.0988.

[Ful93] W. Fulton, *Introduction to toric varieties*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, **131**. The William H. Roever Lectures in Geometry. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[FY14] K. Fujita and K. Yasutake, *Classification of log del Pezzo surfaces of index three*, arXiv:1401.1283.

[HMX12] C. D. Hacon, J. M$^{\text{c}}$Kernan and C. Xu, *ACC for log canonical thresholds*, arXiv:1208.4150.

[HW81] F. Hidaka and K-i. Watanabe, *Normal Gorenstein surfaces with ample anti-canonical divisor*, Tokyo J. Math. **4** (1981), no. 2, 319–330.

[Jia13] C. Jiang, *Bounding the volumes of singular weak log del Pezzo surfaces*, arXiv:1305.6435.

[KM98] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti. Cambridge Tracts in Math., **134**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[Lai12] C-J. Lai, *Bounding the volumes of singular Fano threefolds*, arXiv:1305.6435.

[Mor82] S. Mori, *Threefolds whose canonical bundles are not numerically effective*, Ann. of Math. **116** (1982), no. 1, 133–176.

[Nak07] N. Nakayama, *Classification of log del Pezzo surfaces of index two*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **14** (2007), no. 3, 293–498.

Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502 Japan

E-mail address: fujita@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp